

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain in the present application.

The application has been objected to, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), with the Examiner asserting that the drawings must include every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner requested a drawing which includes the cooling means, particulate filters, activated carbon filter beds, ion exchange resin filter beds, flow through capacitor and reverse osmosis components of the invention. The applicant hereby submits new Figure 4 of the present application which includes all of these components specified by the Examiner. Figure 4 is a flow chart/block diagram which illustrates the process and apparatus aspects of the invention as it is described in the present application in paragraphs [013] through [018], and in U.S. Patent 6,581,375, which is incorporated in the present application. Figure 4 contains no new matter; all aspects shown in Figure 4 are described in the present application as filed. In addition to adding Figure 4, the specification has been amended to add a brief description of the new drawing. In light of this new drawing, it is respectfully requested that the objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 8 and 10 under the doctrine of obvious-type double patenting, based on U.S. Patent 6,581,375. Although the applicant does not believe that the claims of the '375 patent render obvious claims 1, 8 and 10 of the present application, for purposes of expediting prosecution of the present application, a terminal disclaimer with regard to U.S. Patent 6,581,375 is attached. It is respectfully submitted that in light of this terminal disclaimer, the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 2-7, 9 and 11-12, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,581,375 (the '375 patent). Considering the '375 patent as a prior art reference, its disclosure does not render obvious the subject matter claimed in the present application. Specifically, although the '375 patent discloses a process similar to that claimed in the present application, it does not in any way teach or suggest the treatment of the water formed so as to reduce the levels of nitrates, sulfates, acidic and other organic components, prior to step (d), as required by all claims of the present application. Further, the '375 patent does not in any way suggest that the water formed be passed through a flow through capacitor, a

Serial No. 10/849,648

reverse osmosis process or an electrochemical treatment for the purpose of reducing the levels of nitrates, sulfates, acidic or other organic components, or for any other reason. In formulating the rejection, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art of water treatment to do this "to control the conductivity of water in the range of 10 to 80 micro S/cm." However, the Examiner cites no references at all to support this bald assertion. Further, there is nothing in the '375 patent which would in any way suggest that the Examiner's assertion is true. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not applicable, and it respectfully requested that it be withdrawn.


In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is now in form for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are earnestly solicited.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u>	
I hereby certify that a copy of this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on	
<u>Sept. 26</u>	<u>2005</u>
<u>Sarah Abraham</u>	
Sarah Abraham	

Respectfully submitted,

Marit Jagtoyen Mazzetti

By



Steven J. Goldstein

Registration No. 28,079

Attorney for Applicant(s)

FROST BROWN TODD LLC

2200 PNC Center

201 East Fifth Street

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

(513) 651-6167